

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA
GREAT FALLS DIVISION

ORDER

TYSON EAGLEMAN,
Plaintiff,

vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVE HENRY,
Defendants.

CV 24-43-GF-DWM

LARRY DENNY,
Plaintiff,

vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVER HENRY,
Defendants.

CV-24-44-GF-DWM

TOMMY HENDERSON,
Plaintiff,

vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVER HENRY,
Defendants.

CV-24-45-GF-DWM

BLAIR RIDER,
Plaintiff,

vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVER HENRY,
Defendants.

CV-24-46-GF-DWM

HAROLD WHITFORD, SR.,

CV-24-47-GF-DWM

Plaintiff,
vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVER HENRY,
Defendants.

DEREK HENDERSON,
Plaintiff,
vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVER HENRY,
Defendants.

NOAH SUTHERLAND,
Plaintiff,
vs.

ANNALEESE JOHNSON, DALELYNN
HENDERSON, STEVE HENRY,
Defendants.

CV-24-48-GF-DWM

CV-24-49-GF-DWM

The above-identified Plaintiffs, individuals incarcerated at the Chippewa Cree Tribal Adult Detention Center, along with Tyrell Henderson, filed a proposed handwritten Complaint alleging Defendants violated their civil rights from April 12, 2024 to April 19, 2024. It appeared that the plaintiffs wished to proceed as a class in this matter. *See generally* (Doc. 1.)

An Order filed on May 13, 2024, observed that none of the named plaintiffs had filed motions to proceed in forma pauperis, nor had they provided copies of

their inmate account statements. (Doc. 2 at 2.) That Order explained the difficulties associated with prisoner-plaintiffs proceeding together in one action. (*Id.* at 2-5.) Accordingly, the matter was severed and all plaintiffs were advised they would be required to proceed separately on their own claims. (*Id.* at 5.)


Plaintiffs were then informed that if they wished to proceed in this matter they needed to pay the filing fee or submit a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, along with a copy of their inmate account statement, on or before June 15, 2024. (*Id.* at 5-6, 8-9.) Each plaintiff was expressly warned that if he failed to do so, his case would be closed. (*Id.* at 8-9.)

None of the plaintiffs referenced in the caption have complied with the May 13, 2024 Order. Accordingly, these cases are dismissed based upon the respective plaintiffs' failure to comply with a court order. *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-33 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

Based upon the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Each of the above-referenced matters is DISMISSED.
2. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the cases and enter judgment pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
3. The Clerk of Court is additionally directed to have the docket reflect that the Court certifies pursuant to Rule 24(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that any appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

DATED this 25th day of June, 2024.



Donald W. Molloy, District Judge
United States District Court